

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-42 in an office action dated March 29, 2004. Claims 20 and 39-42 have been cancelled. Claims 1-19 and 21-38 remain pending. Claims 1-19, 21-33, 35-38 have been amended. For the following reasons, the amendments do not add new matter.

Claim 1 is directed to a server. It has been amended to include a limitation requiring a means for deciphering a message to determine if the message is a process type message or a request type message. Support for this amendment can be found on page 22, line 15 through page 23, line 5 of the specification. Claims 2-19 have been amended to remain consistent with the Claim 1.

Claim 21 is directed to a hard copy apparatus. It has been amended to include a limitation requiring computer code for deciphering messages to determine if a given message is a process type message or a request type message. Claim 21 has also been amended to include a limitation requiring computer code for discriminately routing messages. Support for these amendments can be found on page 22, line 15 through page 23, line 5 of the specification. Claims 22-30 have been amended to remain consistent with the Claim 21.

Claim 31 is directed to a method for operating a computer peripheral and has been amended to include a limitation requiring storing predetermined subsets of operational parameters where each subset is related to one of a plurality of remote clients.. Support for these amendments can be found on page 10 lines 3-12 of the specification and Fig. 1A of the drawings. Claims 32-33 and 34-38 have been amended to remain consistent with the Claim 31.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 31, and 42 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by USPN 5,220,674 issued to Morgan.

Claim 1: Claim 1 is directed to a server for hard copy apparatus control. As amended, Claim 1 requires the following limitations:

1. means for connecting the apparatus to a network;

2. means for deciphering messages received via the means for connecting to determine if the message is a process type message or a request type message;
3. means for routing deciphered messages received via the means for deciphering such that process and request type messages are discriminatively routed; and
4. means for respectively receiving discriminatively routed messages; and
5. means for executing tasks corresponding to the discriminately routed message.

The second limitation has been affected by amendment in the present response. Nothing Morgan teaches or suggests a means for deciphering messages received via the means for connecting to determine if the message is a process type message or a request type message as required by that limitation. Furthermore, Morgan fails to teach or suggest discriminatively routing such messages or a means for executing tasks corresponding to the discriminately routed message as required by the third and fifth limitations..

For at least these reasons Claim 1 is felt to distinguish over the cited reference.

Claim 31: Claim 8 is directed to a method for operating a computer peripheral apparatus protected by a network firewall. As amended Claim 31 includes the following limitations:

1. providing the apparatus with a server interface;
2. storing predetermined subsets of operational parameters of the apparatus wherein each subset is related to one of a plurality of remote client having access to the server interface; and
3. upon a change of operational parameter state of the apparatus, determining if the change is associated with any subset and sending an electronic message via the server interface to each client associated with the subset or subsets associated with the change wherein the message content includes notification of the change of operational parameter state.

Rejecting Claim 2, the examiner asserts that Morgan, col. 27, line 1 through col. 28, line 45 teaches the second limitation above. To the contrary, the cited section makes no mention of storing predetermined subsets of operational parameters of the apparatus wherein each subset is related to one of a plurality of remote client having access to the server interface as required by that limitation.

The Examiner also asserts that Morgan, col. 21, line 4 through col. 22, line 2 and col. 22, lines 25-30 teach the third limitation. While the cited section makes mention of e-mail notification, it does not teach or suggest determining if a change to an operational parameter state is associated with a subset and then sending an electronic message to a client associated with such a subset as required by the third limitation.

For at least these reasons Claim 31 is felt to distinguish over the cited reference.

Claim 42: Claim 42 has been cancelled rendering its rejection moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-30 and 32-41 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Morgan.

Claims 2-20: Claims 2-20 each ultimately depend from Claim 1 and include all the limitations of that claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claims 2-20.

Claims 21-30: Claim 21 is directed to a hard copy apparatus. As amended Claim 21 includes the following limitations:

1. an embedded server including computer code for providing an internet interface;
2. computer code for handling incoming electronic mail and outgoing electronic mail;

3. computer code for deciphering messages received via the computer code for providing internet interface and messages received via the computer code for handling incoming electronic mail to determine if a given message is a process type message or a request type message;
4. computer code for routing messages from the computer code for deciphering types of messages such that the process and request type messages are discriminately routed; and
5. computer code for processing messages routed by the computer code for routing messages such that the hard copy apparatus printing mechanisms can be controlled according to process type messages and the reportable operational state conditions can be monitored according to request type messages.

The third and fifth limitations have been effected by amendment in the present response. Nothing in Morgan teaches or suggests computer code for deciphering messages received via the computer code for providing internet interface and messages received via the computer code for handling incoming electronic mail to determine if a given message is a process type message or a request type message as required by the third limitation. Morgan fails to teach or suggest computer code for discriminatively routing messages as required by the third limitation. Moreover, Morgan fails to teach or suggest computer code for processing messages such that the hard copy apparatus printing mechanisms can be controlled according to process type messages and the reportable operational state conditions can be monitored according to request type messages as required by the fifth limitation.

For at least these reasons Claim 21 is felt to distinguish over the cited reference. Claims 22-30 each ultimately depend from Claim 21 and include all the limitations of that base claim. For the same reasons Claim 21 is patentable, so are Claims 22-30.


Claims 32-41: Claims 32-38 each ultimately depend from Claim 31 and include all the limitations of that claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 31 is

patentable, so are Claims 32-38. Claims 38-41 have been cancelled rendering their rejection moot.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-19 and 21-38 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Charles H. Hemstreet

By 
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

June 29, 2004